February 1996 PAR–LPTHE 96/06
cond-mat/9602116

arXiv:cond-mat/9602116v1 21 Feb 1996

Effect of randomness in many coupled Potts models.

Pierre Pujol
LPTHE[1]
Université Pierre et Marie Curie, PARIS VI
Université Denis Diderot, PARIS VII
Boite 126, Tour 16, 1er étage
4 place Jussieu
F-75252 Paris CEDEX 05, FRANCE

ABSTRACT

Using 2-loop renormalisation group calculations, we study a system of N two-dimensional Potts models with random bonds coupled together by their local energy density. This model can be seen as a generalization of the random Ashkin-Teller model. We found that, depending on the sign of the coupling term, the universality class of the system in the presence of randomness is different. Under particular consideration, this model presents an example of a first order phase transition rounded by randomness.

[1]Laboratoire associé No. 280 au CNRS

The effect of quenched randomness in two-dimensional systems having a continuous phase transition in its absence has been studied for a large variety of cases. In particular, using a renormalisation group (R.G.) approach, the effect of uncorrelated impurities has been studied for the two-dimensional Ising model [1], Baxter model [2] and for the Potts model [3, 4]. For most of these cases, the Harris criterion [5] provide us a good method to see if disorder will change or not the universality class. For first order phase transition systems, the effect of randomness can be stronger. It was argued in [6] and established in a rigorous way in [7] that for two-dimensional systems the transition becomes continuous in the presence of impurities. Recently, it was shown by Cardy [8] that such phenomenon effectively happens for a large class of systems presenting a fluctuation driven first order transition in the pure case. In view of the results obtained there, it was suggested that the Ising-like transition could be a general feature of two-dimensional systems with randomness. Of particular interest is the random N color Ashkin-Teller model considered in this work. This model can be easily generalized to N coupled q-state Potts model (with $2 \leq q \leq 4$) with random bonds. The aim of this paper is to compare the behavior of this model in the pure case and in the presence of quenched randomness for generic N. Our result is that when impurities are added, the system will present a continuous transition but with different universality classes depending on the sign of the coupling between the models. In any case, the transition is not Ising-like.

Our model consists of N two-dimensional q-state Potts models near the critical point coupled together by their energy operators. This model can be considered as a generalization of the N color Ashkin-Teller model with $2 \leq q < 4$. The Hamiltonian of the system has the following form:

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^{N} H_{0,i} + \int d^2x \; m \sum_{i=1}^{N} \varepsilon_i(x) - g \int d^2x \sum_{i \neq j}^{N} \varepsilon_i \varepsilon_j(x) \; . \tag{1}$$

$H_{0,i}$ are the Hamiltonians of the N Potts models at the critical temperature, m is the reduced temperature, ε corresponds to the energy operator of the pure models and the last term in (1) is the coupling between the different models. This model was well studied in the case $q = 2$ which is the N color Ashkin-Teller model. For $N = 2$ it turns to be integrable [9]. For $N > 2$ the large scale behavior depends on the sign of g: For $g < 0$ it presents an Ising type second order phase transition while for $g > 0$ a fluctuation driven first order phase transition is present [10, 11]. Recently, it was shown [12] that for $N = 2$, $q > 2$ the model is still integrable presenting now a mass generation indicating again a first order phase transition. The situation is not so clear for $N > 2$. In the lack of an exact solution we can give a R.G. approach by studying the large scale behavior of the system for different values of g. This was done in [3, 4] for the case $N \to 0$ in the context of the Potts model with random bonds. A non trivial fixed point was found with critical exponents for the specific heat and magnetic susceptibility which differ from the ones of the pure model.

For generic N, in the limit $m \to 0$, the 2-loop R.G. equations of (1) can be obtained from [4]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta(g) \equiv \frac{dg}{dln(r)} &= \epsilon g(r) + 4\pi(N-2)g^2(r) - 16\pi^2(N-2)g^3(r) + O(g^4(r)) \\
\gamma_\varepsilon \equiv \frac{dln(Z_\varepsilon(r))}{dln(r)} &= 4\pi(N-1)g - 8\pi^2(N-1)g^2 + O(g^3) \\
\gamma_\sigma \equiv \frac{dln(Z_\sigma(r))}{dln(r)} &= (N-1)g^2(r)\pi^2\epsilon \left[1 + 2\frac{\Gamma^2(-\frac{2}{3})\Gamma^2(\frac{1}{6})}{\Gamma^2(-\frac{1}{3})\Gamma^2(-\frac{1}{6})}\right] \\
&\quad + 4(N-1)(N-2)\pi^3 g^3(r) + O(g^4)
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Here, Z_ε and Z_σ are respectively the renormalisation constants of the energy and spin operators and $\epsilon = 2 - 2\Delta_\varepsilon$ where Δ_ε is the physical dimension of the energy operator of the pure model (ϵ differs from that of [4] by a factor of -3, so $\epsilon = 0$ for $q = 2$ and $\epsilon = \frac{2}{5}$ for $q = 3$). For the case $N > 2$, we can see that if $g > 0$ the coupling constant flow far from our perturbative region. Even if a definite proof is not given, a comparison with the case $q = 2$ seems to tell us that a mass gap is dynamically generated indicating a first order phase transition. The situation is completely different for $g < 0$. In this case, we can see that there is a non trivial infrared fixed point at:

$$g_c = -\frac{\epsilon}{4\pi(N-2)} + \frac{\epsilon^2}{4\pi(N-2)^2} + O(\epsilon^3) \tag{3}$$

The critical exponents associated with the energy and spin operators in this new infrared fixed point are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta'_\varepsilon &= \Delta_\varepsilon - \gamma_\varepsilon(g_c) \\ &= \Delta_\varepsilon + \frac{(N-1)}{(N-2)}\epsilon - \frac{(N-1)}{2(N-2)^2}\epsilon^2 + O(\epsilon^3) \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta'_\sigma &= \Delta_\sigma - \gamma_\sigma(g_c) \\ &= \Delta_\sigma - \left(\frac{(N-1)}{8(N-2)^2}\right) \frac{\Gamma^2(-\frac{2}{3})\Gamma^2(\frac{1}{6})}{\Gamma^2(-\frac{1}{3})\Gamma^2(-\frac{1}{6})}\epsilon^3 + O(\epsilon^4) \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

The results obtained in [3, 4] for the case of the quenched random case can be reproduced by just putting $N = 0$ in the formula above and keeping in mind that these results then make sense only for $g > 0$, which in this case g corresponds to the variance of the probability distribution for the random bonds.

Let's consider now adding quenched randomness which couples to the energy operator (e.g. the local energy density). This can be done by introducing in (1) a position dependent random mass term $m \to m(x)$ where $\overline{m(x)} = 0$ and $\overline{m(x)m(y)} = \Delta\delta(x-y)$, with $\Delta > 0$. Using the replica method, we can introduce n copies of the system and average over a Gaussian distribution for m, this will give us a Hamiltonian of nN Potts models coupled by their energy operators. The replicated Hamiltonian is:

$$H = \sum_{i,a} H^a_{0,i} - g\int d^2x \sum_{i\neq j,a} \varepsilon^a_i \varepsilon^a_j(x) - \Delta \int d^2x \sum_{<i,j,a,b>} \varepsilon^a_i \varepsilon^b_j(x) \tag{6}$$

where indices i, j runs from 1 to N and a, b from 1 to n and $< \cdots >$ means that terms with same replica indices are omitted. As explained in [3], this is because these terms produce irrelevant operators or trivial contributions which could just give a shift in the critical temperature. This model was studied at 1-loop level in [8] for the case $q = 2$ (the random Ashkin-Teller model). It was shown that when randomness is present, the R.G. trajectories for the coupling constants run away in a first stage from the U.V. fixed point but finally curl around and approach the fixed point corresponding to N decoupled Ising models.

The procedure to obtain the 2-loops R.G. equations for (6) is the same as in [4]. After some combinatory, we find, taking directly the limit $n \to 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{g} &= \epsilon g + (N-2)g^2 - 2g\Delta - (N-2)g^3 - (2N-5)g^2\Delta + 4g\Delta^2 \\ \dot{\Delta} &= \epsilon\Delta - 2\Delta^2 + 2(N-1)\Delta g + 2\Delta^3 - (N-1)g^2\Delta - 2(N-1)\Delta^2 g \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where for simplicity we have made the change $g \to 4\pi g$, $\Delta \to 4\pi\Delta$. The first step in studying the flow given by (7) is to look for the fixed points $\dot{g} = \dot{\Delta} = 0$. Let's first consider the case $N > 2$. Then, we find four fixed points given by:

$$g = 0 \quad ; \quad \Delta = 0 \tag{8}$$

$$g = -\frac{\epsilon}{(N-2)} + \frac{\epsilon^2}{(N-2)^2} + O(\epsilon^3) \quad ; \quad \Delta = 0 \tag{9}$$

$$g = 0 \quad ; \quad \Delta = \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} + O(\epsilon^3) \tag{10}$$

$$g = \frac{\epsilon^2}{2N} + O(\epsilon^3) \quad ; \quad \Delta = \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{(3N-2)\epsilon^2}{4N} + O(\epsilon^3) \tag{11}$$

The others fixed points present in (7) are of order of constant and so beyond our perturbative region. The non trivial fixed points (9) and (10) are the ones present in the case of N non random coupled models and one random model respectively. There is however a new fixed point (11) that can not be seen at the 1-loop level. As usual, we can study the stability of each of these fixed points by re-expressing (7) around the solutions above $g = g_c + \delta g$, $\Delta = \Delta_c + \delta\Delta$ and keeping only the smallest order in ϵ. This will give us a linear system:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \delta\dot{g} \\ \delta\dot{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} = A \begin{pmatrix} \delta g \\ \delta\Delta \end{pmatrix}$$

The information about the stability of each of these fixed points can be obtained by calculating the eigenvalues of A in each of these cases. In this way it is easy to see that (8) is unstable (for $\epsilon > 0$), (9) and (11) are both stable while (10) is stable only when $g = 0$. This result tell us that the random fixed point found in [3, 4] can not be reached if a small coupling between the different Potts model is added. To study the coupling constant flow , let's first suppose that the initial conditions are $\Delta(0)$, $g(0) > 0$. It is useful in a first stage to keep just the first and second order terms in (7). In this case, it can be shown that for generic ϵ the solution is given by:

$$\Delta(l) = \epsilon\tau\Delta_0(\tau) \quad ; \quad g(l) = \epsilon\tau g_0(\tau) \tag{12}$$

where $\tau = e^{\epsilon l}/\epsilon$, l is the R.G. scale parameter and Δ_0, g_0 are the solutions of (7) with $\epsilon = 0$. A closed form for Δ_0 and g_0 has been given in [8], it is easy to see that for $\tau \to \infty$ we have $g_0(\tau) << \Delta_0(\tau)$ and $\Delta_0(\tau) \sim \frac{1}{2\tau}$. So, the trajectories of the coupling constants for generic ϵ will flow toward the region: $g(l) << \Delta(l)$ and $\Delta(l) \sim \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. This is precisely the region where third order terms in (7) become important indicating that trajectories will asymptotically reach the point (11). We can now calculate the critical exponents associated with the energy and spin operator. Since the difference between the points (10) and (11) is of order ϵ^2 we can not see at this order in perturbation any difference in the spin critical exponent compared to that found in [4] for one Potts model with random bonds. For the energy operator, the correction to the critical exponent up to second order is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta'_\varepsilon &= \Delta_\varepsilon + \Delta_c - (N-1)g_c - \frac{\Delta_c^2}{2} + \cdots \\ &= \Delta_\varepsilon + \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon^2}{8} + O(\epsilon^3) \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

giving surprisingly for generic N the same result as for $N = 1$. Repeating the same arguments, we can show that for initial conditions $\Delta(0) > 0$, $g(0) < 0$ the R.G. trajectories will now flow

toward the point (9) which is the nonrandom fixed point. The critical exponents will be given by (4) and (5) indicating that for this sign of g randomness will not change the large scale behavior of the system.

Let's finally turn to the particular case $N = 2$. As was said before, the non random case is exactly integrable [12] giving a mass for any non zero value of g. It is interesting to see if randomness will increase the order of the transition or will keep a non zero mass in the theory. The R.G. equations are simply obtained by rewriting (7) for $N = 2$:

$$\dot{g} = \epsilon g - 2g\Delta + g^2\Delta + 4g\Delta^2$$

$$\dot{\Delta} = \epsilon\Delta - 2\Delta^2 + 2\Delta g + 2\Delta^3 - g^2\Delta - 2\Delta^2 g \tag{14}$$

The fixed points (8) and (10) are still presents with the same type of stability and (11) becomes now:

$$g = \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} \quad ; \quad \Delta = \frac{\epsilon + \epsilon^2}{2} \tag{15}$$

But now, as expected, (9) has disappeared. In the region $g > 0$ the arguments given for generic N are still valid and trajectories will flow toward the point (15) giving at this order the same spin and energy exponents as for generic N. The difference appear for initial conditions with $g < 0$. In this case, the R.G. trajectories will flow far from our perturbative region. With the results above we can not say if trajectories will flow toward a massive theory or a non perturbative fixed point. A naive analysis of (7) in this case indicates that trajectories will reach asymptotically the integrable line $\Delta = 0$ which gives a massive theory. This would be in contradiction with Imry and Wortis arguments [6] and statements given in [7]. A similar situation happens in the case $q = 2$, $N = 2$ (the random Baxter model) studied in [2]. This example of a system with quenched randomness violate the Harris criterion which is in some sense the second order transition version of Imry-Wortis argument.

In this paper we have analyzed the behavior in presence of quenched randomness of a model which present a very rich structure. Depending on the sign of the coupling g, the nature of the transition is different in the pure case. We found that in the random case, for $N > 2$, whatever the sign of g is, the transition is continuous and different from that of the random Ising model, but the universality classes are different for $g > 0$ and $g < 0$. Moreover, in the case $g < 0$ the disorder doesn't change the universality class of the model. This apparent contradiction of Harris criterion is due to the fact that randomness, which is relevant at the tree level, is driven to be irrelevant by the coupling term. The behavior of the model in the region $g > 0$ is also surprising: the fixed point of $N > 2$ coupled Potts models in the presence of impurities is not the same as found in [3, 4] in the case $N = 1$. The spin and energy exponents remains however, at this order in perturbation, the same for any value of N.

The particular case $N = 2$ is more complicated; for $g > 0$ the behavior of the R.G. flow is similar to the one of the case $N > 2$. Since the pure case is integrable and is a massive theory, we have a system which certainly gives a first order phase transition in the pure case. The presence of randomness makes however the transition continuous. This give a new example of a first order transition rounded by randomness. It is not clear however what finally happens for $g < 0$ and only a non-perturbative treatment would give a definitive answer.

I would like to thank Vl. S. Dotsenko and M. Picco for many helpful suggestions and conversations.

References

[1] Vik. S. Dotsenko and Vl. S. Dotsenko, *Adv. Phys.* **32**, 129 (1983).

[2] Vik. S. Dotsenko and Vl. S. Dotsenko, *J. Phys. A* **17**, L301 (1984).

[3] A. W. W. Ludwig, *Nucl. Phys.* **B285**, 97 (1987); *Nucl. Phys.* **B330**, 639 (1990).

[4] Vl. S. Dotsenko, M. Picco and P. Pujol, *Phys. Lett.* **B 347**, 113 (1995); *Nucl. Phys.* **B 455**, 701 (1995).

[5] A. B. Harris, *J. Phys.* **C7**, 1671 (1974).

[6] Y. Imry and M. Wortis, *Phys. Rev. B* **19**, 3580 (1979).

[7] M. Aizenman and J. Wehr, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **130**, 489 (1990).

[8] J. Cardy, cond-mat@xxx.lanl.gov No. 9511112.

[9] R. J. Baxter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **26**, 832 (1971); L. P. Kadanoff and F. J. Wegner, *Phys. Rev.* **B 4**, 3989 (1971); F. Y. Wu *Phys. Rev.* **B 4**, 3212 (1971).

[10] E. Fradkin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **21**, 1967 (1984).

[11] R. Shankar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **5**, 453 (1985).

[12] I. Vaysburd, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 446**, 387 (1995).